PUBLIC MATTER

1 2 3 4 5 6	STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL MELANIE J. LAWRENCE, No. 230102 INTERIM CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL SUSAN CHAN, No. 233229 ASSISTANT CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL ROBERT A. HENDERSON, No. 173205 SUPERVISING ATTORNEY MARIA J. OROPEZA, No. 182660 SENIOR TRIAL COUNSEL 180 Howard Street San Francisco, California 94105-1639 Telephone: (415) 538-2569	FILED SEP 0 7 2018 STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO					
8							
9	STATE BA	R COURT					
10	HEARING DEPARTMENT - SAN FRANCISCO						
11							
12	In the Matter of:	Case No. 16-O-10277 [16-O-15762]					
13	DANIEL EVERETT,) No. 268967,)	NOTICE OF DISCIPLINARY CHARGES					
14	}						
15	A Member of the State Bar						
16	NOTICE - FAILUR	RE TO RESPOND!					
17							
18	IF YOU FAIL TO FILE A WRITTEN ANSWER TO THIS NOTICE WITHIN 20 DAYS AFTER SERVICE, OR IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT THE STATE BAR COURT TRIAL:						
19	(1) YOUR DEFAULT WILL BE ENT	ERED:					
20	(2) YOUR STATUS WILL BE CHANGED TO INACTIVE AND YOU WILL NOT BE PERMITTED TO PRACTICE LAW;						
	(3) YOU WILL NOT BE PERMITTE	D TO PARTICIPATE FURTHER IN					
21	AND THE DEFAULT IS SET ASI						
22		TO TIMELY MOVE TO SET ASIDE					
23	ORDER RECOMMENDING Y	THIS COURT WILL ENTER AN YOUR DISBARMENT WITHOUT					
24	FURTHER HEARING OR PROC	EEDING. SEE RULE 5.80 ET SEQ., E STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA.					
25							
26	The State Bar of California alleges:						
27	The blace bar of camornia aneges.	227 204 995					

-1-

JURISDICTION

1. Daniel Everett ("respondent") was admitted to the practice of law in the State of California on February 5, 2010, was a member at all times pertinent to these charges, and is currently a member of the State Bar of California.

COUNT ONE

Case No. 16-O-10277
Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i)
[Failure to Cooperate in State Bar Investigation]

2. Respondent failed to cooperate and participate in a disciplinary investigation pending against respondent by failing to provide a substantive response to the State Bar's letters of January 26, 2016; March 2, 2016; and May 9, 2018, which respondent received, that requested respondent's response to the allegations of misconduct being investigated in case no. 16-O-10277, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(i).

COUNT TWO

Case No. 16-O-15762 Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 5-200(B) [Seeking to Mislead a Judge, Judicial Officer or Jury]

- 3. Respondent wilfully violated Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 5-200(B), in presenting a matter to a tribunal, by seeking to mislead a judge, judicial officer, or jury by an artifice or false statement of fact or law, as follows:
 - A. On or about August 19, 2013, respondent filed case number 13-31855-HLB, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Northern District of California (San Francisco). Respondent was required to disclose any and all previously filed bankruptcy petitions. Respondent failed to disclose that on or about April 15, 2013 he had filed case number 13-17960-KCF a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of New Jersey.
 - B. On or about September 23, 2013, respondent filed case number 13-32111 HLB, a chapter 13 bankruptcy in the Northern District of California (San
 Francisco). Respondent was required to disclose any and all previously filed

bankruptcy petitions. Respondent failed to disclose that on or about April 15, 2013 he had filed case number 13-17960-KCF a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of New Jersey. Respondent failed to disclose that on or about August 19, 2013, he had filed case number 13-31855-HLB, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Northern District of California (San Francisco).

- C. On or about November 6, 2013, respondent filed case number 13-09272-ESL, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of Puerto Rico. Respondent was required to disclose any and all previously filed bankruptcy petitions. Respondent failed to disclose that on or about April 15, 2013 he had filed case number 13-17960-KCF a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of New Jersey. Respondent failed to disclose that on or about August 19, 2013, respondent filed case number 13-31855-HLB, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Northern District of California (San Francisco).
- D. On or about November 19, 2013, respondent filed case number 13-30015-MFW, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District Court of the Virgin Islands. Respondent was required to disclose any and all previously filed bankruptcy petitions. Respondent failed to disclose that on or about April 15, 2013 he had filed case number 13-17960-KCF a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of New Jersey. Respondent failed to disclose that on or about September 23, 2013 he had filed case number 13-32111-HLB in the Northern District of California (San Francisco). Respondent failed to disclose that on or about November 6, 2013, respondent filed case number 13-09272-ESL, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of Puerto Rico.
- E. On or about December 5, 2014, respondent filed case number 14-18854-MLB, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Western District of Washington. Respondent was required to disclose any and all previously filed bankruptcy petitions.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	0
	1
	2
	3
	4
1	5
l	6

Respondent failed to disclose that on or about April 15, 2013 he had filed case number 13-17960-KCF a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of New Jersey.

F. On or about July 6, 2015 respondent filed case number 15-52214-MEH, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Northern District of California (San Jose).

Respondent was required to disclose any and all previously filed bankruptcy petitions. Respondent failed to disclose that on or about April 15, 2013 he had filed case number 13-17960-KCF a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of New Jersey. Respondent failed to disclose that on or about August 19, 2013 he had filed case number 13-31855-HLB a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Northern District of California (San Francisco). Respondent failed to disclose that on or about September 23, 2013 he had filed case number 13-32111-HLB a chapter 13 bankruptcy in the Northern District of California (San Francisco.) Respondent failed to disclose that on or about December 5, 2014, respondent filed case number 14-18854-MLB, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Western District of Washington.

COUNT THREE

Case No. 16-O-15762
Business and Professions Code, section 6103
[Failure to Obey a Court Order]

4. Respondent disobeyed or violated an order of the court requiring respondent to do or forbear an act connected with or in the course of respondent's profession which respondent ought in good faith to do or forbear by failing to comply with the January 21, 2015 Western District of Washington Bankruptcy Court Order in case number 14-18854-MBL, which prohibited respondent from filing any new bankruptcy petition within two years of the January 21, 2015 order. On July 6, 2015, respondent filed case number 15-52214-MEH a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Northern District of California (San Jose), in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6103.

COUNT FOUR

Case No. 16-O-15762
Business and Professions Code, section 6068(b)
[Failure to Maintain Respect to the Court]

5. Respondent failed to maintain respect to the court when he disobeyed or violated an order of the court issued on January 21, 2015 by the Western District of Washington Bankruptcy Court Order in case number 14-18854-MBL, which prohibited respondent from filing any new bankruptcy petition within two years of the January 21, 2015 order. On July 6, 2015, respondent filed case number 15-52214-MEH a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Northern District of California (San Jose), in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(b).

COUNT FIVE

Case No. 16-O-15762
Business and Professions Code, section 6068(d)
[Seeking to Mislead a Judge]

- 6. Between on or about April 15, 2013 and on or about July 6, 2015, respondent stated in his bankruptcy petitions that he had been domiciled or had a residence, principal place of business, or principal assets in each of the districts for at least 180 days immediately preceding the date of the bankruptcy petition in the districts identified below, respondent attested that he lived in each district for at least 180 days and respondent knew the statement was false, and thereby sought to mislead the judge or judicial officer by an artifice or false statement of fact or law, in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6068(d):
 - A. On or about April 15, 2013 respondent filed case number 13-17960-KCF a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of New Jersey and attested that he had lived in the district for at least 180 days. Respondent listed his address as 1 Lancaster Drive, West Hampton NJ 08060 ("Lancaster drive".) Lancaster Drive is a private residence, which sold in 2011 and is currently in foreclosure. Respondent did not list Lancaster Drive in the real property listing of his chapter 7 petition, indicating that he owned the property. Respondent represented that he had resided or been domiciled at the Lancaster Drive address between 2011-2013.

- B. On or about November 6, 2013, respondent filed case number 13-09272-ESL, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of Puerto Rico and attested that there was a bankruptcy case concerning debtor's affiliate, general partner or partnership in the district. Respondent listed his address as 1 San Geronimo Street, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00901 (San Geronimo.) He did list San Francisco as his county of residence or principal place of business.
- C. On or about November 19, 2013, respondent filed case number 13-30015-MFW, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District Court of the Virgin Islands and attested that the debtor was a debtor in a foreign proceeding and that he had his principal place of business or principal assets in the United States in the District or had no principal place of business or assets in the United States but was a defendant in an action or proceeding in a federal or state court in the District or the interests of the parties would be served in regard to the relief sought in the District. Respondent listed his address as 7338 Estate Bakkeroe Saint Thomas, St. Thomas US Virgin Isla (Estate Bakkeroe.) He did list San Francisco as his county of residence or principal place of business.
- D. On or about December 5, 2014, respondent filed case number 14-18854-MLB, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Western District of Washington and attested that he had been domiciled or resided in the district for at least 180 days. He listed his address as 4136 21st Avenue Southwest, Seattle Washington 98106 (21st Avenue.)
- E. On or about July 6, 2015 respondent filed case number 15-52214-MEH, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Northern District of California (San Jose) and attested that he had been domiciled or resided in the district for at least 180 days. He listed his address as 5609 Silver Creek Valley Rd., San Jose, CA 95138 ("Silver Creek".) The address belongs to a business center.

COUNT SIX

Case No. 16-O-15762
Business and Professions Code, section 6106
[Moral Turpitude - Misrepresentation]

7. On or about April 15, 2013 through on or about July 6, 2015, respondent stated in writing to the bankruptcy district courts in his bankruptcy petitions that that he was domiciled in the district when respondent knew that statements was false and misleading. Respondent thereby committed an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in willful violation of Business and Professions Code, section 6106

A. On or about April 15, 2013 respondent filed case number 13-17960-KCF a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of New Jersey and attested that he had lived in the district for at least 180 days. Respondent listed his address as 1 Lancaster Drive, West Hampton NJ 08060 ("Lancaster drive".) Lancaster Drive is a private residence, which sold in 2011 and is currently in foreclosure. Respondent did not list Lancaster Drive in the real property listing of his chapter 7 petition, indicating that he owned the property. Respondent represented that he had resided or been domiciled at the Lancaster Drive address between 2011-2013.

- B. On or about November 6, 2013, respondent filed case number 13-09272-ESL, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District of Puerto Rico and attested that there was a bankruptcy case concerning debtor's affiliate, general partner or partnership in the district. Respondent listed his address as 1 San Geronimo Street, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00901 (San Geronimo.) He did list San Francisco as his county of residence or principal place of business.
- C. On or about November 19, 2013, respondent filed case number 13-30015-MFW, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the District Court of the Virgin Islands and attested that the debtor was a debtor in a foreign proceeding and that he had his principal place of business or principal assets in the United States in the District or had no principal place of business or assets in the United States but was a

defendant in an action or proceeding in a federal or state court in the District or the interests of the parties would be served in regard to the relief sought in the District. Respondent listed his address as 7338 Estate Bakkeroe Saint Thomas, St. Thomas US Virgin Isla (Estate Bakkeroe.) He did list San Francisco as his county of residence or principal place of business.

- D. On or about December 5, 2014, respondent filed case number 14-18854-MLB, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Western District of Washington and attested that he had been domiciled or resided in the district for at least 180 days. He listed his address as 4136 21st Avenue Southwest, Seattle Washington 98106 (21st Avenue.)
- E. On or about July 6, 2015 respondent filed case number 15-52214-MEH, a chapter 7 bankruptcy in the Northern District of California (San Jose) and attested that he had been domiciled or resided in the district for at least 180 days. He listed his address as 5609 Silver Creek Valley Rd., San Jose, CA 95138 ("Silver Creek".) The address belongs to a business center.
- 8. A violation of section 6106 may result from intentional conduct or grossly negligent conduct. Respondent is charged with committing intentional misrepresentation. However, should the evidence at trial demonstrate that respondent committed misrepresentation as a result of gross negligence, respondent must still be found culpable of violating section 6106 because misrepresentation through gross negligence is a lesser included offense of intentional misrepresentation.

COUNT SEVEN

Case No. 16-O-15762
Business and Professions Code, section 6068(b)
[Failure to Maintain Respect to the Court]

9. Between on or about April 15, 2013 through on or about December 5, 2014, respondent filed multiple bankruptcy petitions in multiple districts and thereafter failed to properly or timely prosecute the cases or otherwise fulfill his obligations under the bankruptcy

code, thereby abusing the bankruptcy system, respondent thereby wilfully violated Business and Professions Code, section 6068(b), by failing to maintain the respect due to the courts of justice and judicial officers as noted below:

)
6
7

Case Number	I hanter Name Llote Hilled Lin		District	Disposition	
13-17960	7	Daniel Choe Everett	April 15, 2013	New Jersey	Dismissed May 1, 2013 for file to pay filing fees.
13-31855	7	Daniel O'Blenis	August 19, 2013	Northern District of California	Dismissed on October 1, 2013 for failure to file information.
13-32111	13	Daniel Everett	September 23, 2013	Northern District of California	Dismissed on October 18, 2013 for failure to pay filing fees.
13-09272	7	Daniel Everett O'Blenis	November 6, 2013	District of Puerto Rico	Dismissed on November 18, 2013 for failure to pay filing fees.
13-30015	7	Daniel Everett O'Blenis	November 19, 2013	District Court Virgin Islands	Dismissed in on Dec. 11, 2013, for failure to file documents and pay filing fees
14-43328	13	Daniel Everett O'Blenis	August 12, 2014	Northern District California	Dismissed on August 22, 2014 for failure to file documents.
14-18854	7	Daniel Everett	December 5, 2014	Western District Washington	Dismissed on January 21, 2015 with prejudice; barred from filing any new bankruptcy petitions for two years.

///

NOTICE - INACTIVE ENROLLMENT!

YOU ARE HEREBY FURTHER NOTIFIED THAT IF THE STATE BAR COURT FINDS, PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6007(c), THAT YOUR CONDUCT POSES A SUBSTANTIAL THREAT OF HARM TO THE INTERESTS OF YOUR CLIENTS OR TO THE PUBLIC, YOU MAY BE INVOLUNTARILY ENROLLED AS AN INACTIVE MEMBER OF THE STATE BAR. YOUR INACTIVE ENROLLMENT WOULD BE IN ADDITION TO ANY DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED BY THE COURT.

NOTICE - COST ASSESSMENT!

IN THE EVENT THESE PROCEDURES RESULT IN PUBLIC DISCIPLINE, YOU MAY BE SUBJECT TO THE PAYMENT OF COSTS INCURRED BY THE STATE BAR IN THE INVESTIGATION, HEARING AND REVIEW OF THIS MATTER PURSUANT TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 6086.10.

By:

Respectfully submitted,

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF CHIEF TRIAL COUNSEL

DATED: September 7, 2018

Maria J. Oropeza Senior Trial Counsel

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

U.S. FIRST-CLASS MAIL / U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL / OVERNIGHT DELIVERY / FACSIMILE-ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

CASE NUMBER(s): 16-O-10277 [16-O-15762]

I, the undersigned, am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the within action, whose business address and place of employment is the State Bar of California, 180 Howard Street, San Francisco, California 94105, declare that:

- Of the date shown bek	ow, I caused to be served a true copy of the within docum	ent described as follows:				
	NOTICE OF DISCIPI	LINARY CHARGES	and the same of th			
By U.S. First-Class M - in accordance with the - of San Francisco.	By U.S. First-Class Mail: (CCP §§ 1013 and 1013(a)) in accordance with the practice of the State Bar of California for collection and processing of mail, I deposited or placed for collection and mailing in the City and Country of San Francisco.					
By Overnight Deliver	By Overnight Delivery: (CCP §§ 1013(c) and 1013(d)) - I am readily familiar with the State Bar of California's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for overnight delivery by the United Parcel Service ('UPS').					
By Fax Transmission: (CCP §§ 1013(e) and 1013(f)) Based on agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the fax numbers listed herein below. No error was reported by the fax machine that I used. The original record of the fax transmission is retained on file and available upon request.						
By Electronic Service Based on a court order or addresses listed herein be unsuccessful.	e: (CCP § 1010.6) an agreement of the parties to accept service by electror elow. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the t	ic transmission, I caused the documents ransmission, any electronic message or	to be sent to the person(s) at the electronic other indication that the transmission was			
(for U.S. First-Class Mail	in a sealed envelope placed for collection and ma	ailing at San Francisco, addressed to	D: (see below)			
	a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailin					
Article No.:		Francisco, addressed to: (see below				
for Overnight Delivery) Tracking No.:	together with a copy of this declaration, in an enve	lope, or package designated by UPs addressed to: (see below)	3,			
Person Served	Business-Residential Address	Fax Number	Courtesy Copy to:			
aniel Everett	Law Office of Daniel Everett 15 Boardman Pl Ste 2 San Francisco, CA 94103-4724					
9	Article No. 9414 7266 9904 2112 6609 79	A Milagon Common				
Zadik Shapiro	2139 Knox Ave, Pittsburg, CA 94565-4736	Electronic Address				
	Article No. 9414 7266 9904 2069 9462 32	And designation of the second	00			
via inter-office mail regular	ly processed and maintained by the State Bar o	f California addressed to:	genegaripudi malimujan mpaji para isa simiya ajangga angara juundu munummya anasa isasasisis, ajaasisisa angam 👝 🐋			
ľ	N/A					
emiant delivery by the United Par	e State Bar of California's practice for collection and proc cel Service ('UPS'). In the ordinary course of the State Ba ne United States Postal Service that same day, and for ov	ar of California's practice, correspondence	a collected and processed by the State Box of			
I am aware that on motion	of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal c	ancellation date or postage meter date of	n the envelope or package is more than one day			

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at San Francisco, California, on the date shown below.

DATED: September 7, 2018

SIGNED: Dawn Williams

Declarant

State Bar of California DECLARATION OF SERVICE